The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2023

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3308859
110 Chessington Hill Park, Chessington KT9 2BL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs B Bridges against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
- The application Ref 21/04064/HOU, dated 12 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2022.
- The development proposed is second floor extension with associated internal alterations.

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 9th May 2023.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Chessington Hill Park is part of a wider housing estate characterised by a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties that are predominantly two storey but of varying designs. The road rises uphill, and no. 110 is a two storey detached dwelling located at the end of the road. A footpath adjacent to no. 110 connects Chessington Hill Park with Chantry Road which abuts the side elevation of the property.

4. The appeal property is in a prominent position located at the top of Chessington Hill Park and the side elevation is on the outside of a bend in Chantry Road. The proposal would extend the property upwards to provide a complete third floor which requires a significant height increase. From my observations the majority of properties within the vicinity are two storey, therefore the proposal would be higher than surrounding dwellings.

5. The proposed increase in height would be exaggerated due to the property's prominent position in the street which would out of keeping with its surroundings in terms of building height, particularly along Chantry Road. The materials would match the existing dwelling and would be acceptable and the design is in keeping with the existing dwelling. However, due to the height of

the proposed extension, it would, in this setting make the property appear incongruous and inconsistent with the surrounding properties.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to accord with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012) (LP) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (Adopted March 2021) (TLP), which between them require that proposed developments relate well to and connect to their surroundings, and contribute positively to the character and local distinctiveness of an area.

Other Matters

7. Due to the orientation of the dwelling and position of the extension on the dwelling in relation to neighbouring properties, the extension would not affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, this matter does not affect the considerations that have led to my decision.

8. The report of the Council's Officer into this application appears to be in a draft format with several unclear elements. The report has referred to a recommendation for approval subject to conditions. However, the main body of the report and decision notice indicate this is a typographical error.

9. The report of the Council's Officer refers to the site being in the Green Belt. The Council has since confirmed that this was a drafting error, and the site is not within the Green Belt therefore I am satisfied that the proposal does not affect openness.

10. I note that the Council considered that the proposal did not affect flood risk or heritage assets, I have no reason to disagree with these conclusions based on the information provided.

11. The above matters relating to the report of the Council's Officer do not affect the considerations that have led to my decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the second floor extension would not accord with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the LP or Policy D3 of TLP. Although the proposal does not conflict with other policies of the development plan, this leads me to conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR